

University of Groningen

## Origins of Differentiation in Critical Security Schools

Sezal, Mustafa

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Sezal, M. (2019). *Origins of Differentiation in Critical Security Schools: A philosophic-genealogical search for emancipatory roots*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

## 5. Conceptual Analysis: Roots and Differentiations

The three schools, Aberystwyth, Copenhagen, and Paris, that constitute the subject of this dissertation have been introduced and explained comprehensively in the previous chapter, albeit only in strictly theoretical terms. Theory and philosophical backgrounds are essential for a deep comparison and digging out the causes of differentiation. In this chapter, the approaches of the three schools are applied to the '(global) war on terror(ism)' to depict the manner of analysis that we would expect based on the theoretical explanations provided in the previous chapters when applied to an empirical case. It is indicative of the contested nature of the event that it has been named differently in different places. While Buzan and Hansen use the term "Global War on Terrorism",<sup>344</sup> in other sources it is sometimes depicted as "War on Terrorism"<sup>345</sup> or "War on Terror"<sup>346</sup> or "Global War on Terror",<sup>347</sup> therefore to show the debatable nature of this event I chose to formulate it as the (Global) War on Terror(ism). But for the sake of the flow of the chapter, it is abbreviated as GWOt.

The first section introduces the conceptual framework and tools that will be used in the chapter in a traditional text-book sense as explained in Chapter 1. Then in the second section, the GWOt is narrated through reported facts and events without commentaries to create a benchmark for the interpretation. In the third section, the mainstream (realist and liberal) perceptions of the GWOt in the IR discipline are explored. It constitutes the mainstream/traditional narrative of the case study that is used as a yardstick to show the degree of 'criticality' of the schools with respect to mainstream IR perspectives. Then, at the core of this chapter the three critical schools are used to re-tell the narratives. This involves a manner of immanent critique to show discrepancies as well as similar/different philosophical linkages among the schools. In the final section, the findings of each school will be compared, contrasted, and most

---

<sup>344</sup> Buzan and Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies*

<sup>345</sup> Richard Jackson et al., *Terrorism: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

<sup>346</sup> Alan Collins, ed. *Contemporary Security Studies*, Fourth ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

<sup>347</sup> Ondrej Beranek, ed. *Europe, the Middle East, and the Global War on Terror: Critical Reflections* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2012).

importantly re-evaluated through their philosophical backgrounds depicting their ontological and epistemological connexion.

### 5.1. This May Be True in Theory, but Does It Hold in Practice?

‘Terrorism’ as a wide and uncertain concept has been chosen as the conceptual starting point for the empirical case application. There are many different definitions and approaches to ‘terrorism’ each implicating and favouring a certain way for analysis. Lack of a generally agreed definition is problematic for analytical purposes but informative regarding the political and subjective nature of the concept itself.

An important question rises here. Would it be more useful to provide a somewhat general definition or would it be better suited for analysis if the concept is defined through the perspectives of the subject schools? It would be difficult and speculative to derive a definition of ‘terrorism’ through the theoretical underpinnings discussed in the previous chapter. There have been numerous definitions of ‘terrorism’ based on the affiliation and purpose of the actor who defined the concept. While states and international organisations may have defined terrorism in one way<sup>348</sup>, scholars chose to accept or reject these definitions depending on their ‘criticality’.<sup>349</sup>

---

<sup>348</sup> For example for the US, the 18 United States Code states “the term “international terrorism” means activities that—

(A) involve violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or of any State; (B) appear to be intended—

- (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;
- (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or
- (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and (C) occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or transcend national boundaries in terms of the means by which they are accomplished, the persons they appear intended to intimidate or coerce, or the locale in which their perpetrators operate or seek asylum”

<sup>349</sup> For a brief but significant exposition on ‘criticality’ see: Xavier Guillaume, “Criticality,” in *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*, ed. Mark B. Salter and Can E. Mutlu (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).

Nonetheless, there needs to be a conception of 'terrorism' for the sake of the argument and flow of the dissertation. For this, I have chosen a definition which seemed to be the broadest and the least ideological. Based on Booth and Dunne's pluralist volume 'terrorism' can be understood as the broad term that refers to violent acts committed by individuals, private groups, and states, mainly against civilians that seek to influence behaviour and produce fear to achieve certain political ends.<sup>350</sup> As an extension of this definition, the concept's relationship with security will be derived from each schools' perspective. This definition may seem biased towards a 'critical' perspective because 'state' is also considered as a potential perpetrator, however, the definition includes every potential agency with regard to terrorism, a sufficient degree of impartiality is maintained. 'Terrorism' as such cannot be studied as an event, it would rather be an analytical category. As an empirical instance of this category, '(Global) War on Terror(ism)' has been selected. There are a few reasons for this. As explained in the previous chapters, Critical Security Schools mainly emerged and came to the fore in the post-Cold War era. This would indicate that these new schools are a product and part of this era and therefore more equipped to analyse and understand the acts that are also the product of the new era. There are again many instances in this period, yet even the precursor events such as the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993 or USS Cole in 2000 are actually closely connected to the beginning of the GWoT. Furthermore, it is a temporally spread event encompassing many years and ensuring a continuing body of literature, which makes it easier to depict roots and differentiations.

In the Security Studies field, textbooks provide several overarching questions to explain how each theory perceives and analyses the subject matter. Without a doubt, good questions are at the core of any serious research. Accordingly, asking certain questions to three 'critical schools' regarding the GWoT will provide a sound methodology. Sometimes, however, responses may be absent or identical. This is not problematic but very much in line with the central claim of the enquiry that this dissertation attempts.

---

<sup>350</sup> Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, "Worlds in Collision," in *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, ed. Ken Booth and Tim Dunne (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 8.

The basic questions in textbooks firstly ask who the referent object is, meaning that who are affected by 'security' however it is defined.<sup>351</sup> Then it is important to understand what security entails. Yet, this is different from defining security per se. Rather than a conceptual definition, this question unfolds what is seen as a security issue by the referent object. The next question is the extension of it as to seeking to reveal the reason why the answer is considered as a security issue. The final question is, very seldom asked except for certain concrete policy advice. This question is, essentially related to the normative feature of the critical approaches. Each one promotes a certain course of action to deal with security issues and it is significant in terms of grasping connexions and ruptures along the ontologies of these approaches. While these are the questions behind each analysis, questions are not posed directly but answered rather in a narrative style. That is to show how the re-tellings paint us differentiated perspectives and their combination provides a much more 'real' picture. Before starting the analyses and focusing on the responses let us remember what the GWoT is and how it can be described through events it involves.

### **5.1.1. (Global) War on Terror(ism)**

On 11 September 2001 three passenger planes hijacked by al-Qaeda operatives were flown into the Twin Towers of the World Trade Centre in New York City and the Pentagon (US Department of Defense Headquarters) in Arlington, while a fourth one crashed in Pennsylvania before it could reach its intended destination (possibly the White House and/or the U.S. Capitol). According to news sources, 2,996 people were killed and more than 6,000 were injured as a result of the attacks. Following the immediate relief efforts and many public addresses, on 16 September 2001, the (then) President of the United States of America, George W. Bush, first referred to the

---

<sup>351</sup> See: Paul D. Williams, "Security Studies: An Introduction," in *Security Studies: An Introduction*, ed. Paul D. Williams (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008).

forthcoming response to the attacks as “war against terrorism”.<sup>352</sup> It was four days later that he officially declared ‘war’. On 20 September 2001, in his address to the joint session of congress, President Bush declared that “[o]ur war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.”<sup>353</sup> This was the beginning of a long war which still has not ended. International relations, particularly, transatlantic relations and the Middle Eastern politics have been shaped by this ongoing war.

This section is not about the broad literature on al-Qaeda’s attacks or the Global War on Terror (GWO’T) following the attacks, but rather it illustrates the manner each critical security school responded to this so-called war. This allows us to see how the theories apply to a real-world event, how do their propositions fare with respect to practical analysis, and how do they re-tell the story through their own lenses. For a re-telling, however, a first “telling”, an initial narrative is required. Therefore, without getting into the intricacies of analytics the mainstream narrative, however it is framed, will be provided. Since the critical schools attempt at a critique of the mainstream and traditional it would lay the basis for their re-tellings. So what happened after Bush declared a ‘war’ and how did the story unfold?

It is common knowledge that the US initiated the ‘Operation Enduring Freedom’ on 7 October 2001 by launching air-strikes in Afghanistan and in November 2002 expanded it by deploying ground troops. It is important to remember that the land phase of the operation after December 2002 was sanctioned by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 1386 and given under the auspices of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). This force was consisting of all the NATO members as well as some other partner countries. Also notable is that the fifth article of the North Atlantic Treaty, which stated that an attack towards a member-state would be accepted as an attack towards all the member-states, was invoked for the first time in history.<sup>354</sup> There

---

<sup>352</sup> "Remarks by the President Upon Arrival," <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html>.

<sup>353</sup> CNN, "Transcript of President Bush's Address," <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/>.

<sup>354</sup> Article 5 is as follows: "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed

were, of course, voices against the operation, but the general sentiment was that the 'international community' supported it.

The most critical moment came when the US and the UK decided to invade Iraq and topple Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist regime. The main mission of the invasion, dubbed as 'Operation Iraqi Freedom' by the US and started on 20 March 2003, was "to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, to end Saddam Hussein's support for terrorism, and to free the Iraqi people".<sup>355</sup> These were, however, were not substantiated claims and rested on speculations and unreliable sources (as later on proved in the reports). Unlike the war in Afghanistan, the UNSC did not sanction a military campaign against Iraq. As a result, on one hand, the invasion was deemed as a breach of international law although no concrete action could be taken. On the other hand, participants of the invasion, particularly the US and the UK, claimed to be acting in accordance with the 34th clause of the UNSC Resolution 687 of 1991 which stated that in case Iraq did not comply with the resolution, further steps could be taken to "secure peace and security in the area".<sup>356</sup> UNSC Resolution 1441 of 2002 has also been used a pretext despite having no mention of military response but warns that non-compliance will lead to "serious consequences".<sup>357</sup> The problem, however, was that the intelligence on Iraq having weapons of mass destruction proved to be faulty and reports (Duelfer Report in the US and the Chilcot Report in the UK) declared

---

attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security." NATO, "The North Atlantic Treaty," [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official\\_texts\\_17120.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm).

<sup>355</sup> "President Discusses Beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom," <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030322.html>.

<sup>356</sup> Security Council Resolution 687, S/RES/687 (1991).

<sup>357</sup> Security Council Resolution 1441, S/RES/1441 (2002).

that Iraq did indeed dismantle its stockpiles after 1991, so the pretext for the war was false.<sup>358</sup>

The war in Afghanistan continued until 28 December 2014 and the war in Iraq until 18 December 2011 when, in both cases, the US President Barack Obama declared that the operations were over. According to the *Costs of War* project at Brown University's Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, as of August 2016, more than 31,000 civilians are estimated to have died violent deaths and more 41,000 have been injured as a result of the GWoT since 2001 only in Afghanistan.<sup>359</sup> It is estimated that around 165,000 civilians have died in Iraq as a direct consequence of the war in Iraq but this is believed to be a very conservative estimate.<sup>360</sup> The indirect casualties are thought to be much higher than these estimates. Additionally, at least 43,000 allied troops and police have died and over 75,000 wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan.<sup>361</sup>

The GWoT officially ended on 23 May 2013 when the then President Barack Obama declared that "[w]e must define our effort not as a boundless 'global war on terror,' but rather as a series of persistent, targeted efforts to dismantle specific networks of violent extremists that threaten America"<sup>362</sup> although Obama administration opted for not using the term 'war on terror' early into power. Furthermore, the UK government officially refrained from referring to the 'war on terror' starting in 2006 and onwards. Despite the official GWoT is deemed to be over, the rise of the Islamic State (ISIS or ISIL or Daesh) in Iraq and Syria created a new conflict in which the US decided to respond with 'Operation Inherent Resolve' which started in 2014 and still continues. Although established long before, ISIS rose in the

---

<sup>358</sup> Charles Duelfer, "Comprehensive Report of the Special Advisor to the Dci on Iraq's Wmd, with Addendums," (Central Intelligence Agency, 2005); Sir John Chilcot et al., "The Report of the Iraq Inquiry," (London: The Iraq Inquiry, 2016).

<sup>359</sup> Neta C. Crawford, "Afghan Civilians - Cost of War," Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, <http://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/civilians/afghan>.

<sup>360</sup> Neta C. Crawford, "Iraqi Civilians - Costs of War," Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, <http://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/civilians/iraqi>.

<sup>361</sup> Anila Daulatzai, Catherine Lutz, and Ken MacLeish, "Us & Allied Killed and Wounded - Costs of War," Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, <http://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/military>.

<sup>362</sup> "Remarks by the President at the National Defense University," <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/23/remarks-president-national-defense-university>.



power vacuum during the US-led invasion of Iraq. In addition to al-Qaeda and similar fundamentalist elements, ex-Iraqi army officers also found refuge in the ranks of the ISIS.

The process which is called the GWoT was not only about military operations but also involved domestic and international legislations, intergovernmental agreements, institution building, industrial and technological innovations, and merging of sectors which created intertwined 'new' practices.

### **5.1.2. GWoT Told by the Mainstream IR Scholarship**

It is imperative to explain and show how the mainstream IR scholarship responded to the attacks and the subsequent GWoT so that the criticality of the critical re-tellings could be explored meticulously. Put differently, this narrative constitutes the object that the critical approaches are critical of. Therefore, critical security schools will be re-telling this narrative through their own critique and reveal problematic parts as well as disrupting the objectivist claims mainstream scholarship defend.

The initial response, particularly the war in Afghanistan, did not produce analyses that focused on the theoretical issues but rather strategy and tactics. It was mostly seen as an appropriate response to such an atrocious act. It is interesting that the majority of the analyses by the mainstream scholarship did not focus on Afghanistan, but rather dealt with the issue as a whole together with Al-Qaeda, Iraq and the Middle East in general. Few articles written between the beginning of the Afghanistan campaign and the Iraq war (i.e. by Stephen Walt) emphasised the failures of the US Foreign Policy claiming that the US was not as popular as it thought and the failed states were a national security problem for the US.<sup>363</sup> Therefore, fight against al-Qaeda and doing it in failed states like Afghanistan was appropriate. Here another

---

<sup>363</sup> Stephen M. Walt, "Beyond Bin Laden: Reshaping U.S. Foreign Policy," *International Security* 26, no. 3 (2001): 59-63.

interesting point is that while Walt was determined in 2001 that the campaign in Afghanistan was a correct strategy, in 2009 he claimed that the argument that Afghanistan was a 'safe haven' for al-Qaeda was a myth.<sup>364</sup> Therefore it is difficult to pinpoint coherent argumentation on behalf of these mainstream scholars who are too close to the power centres. Furthermore, many scholars argued that terrorism was indeed a very significant security threat for the US and thus it had to act against it.<sup>365</sup>

The tides, however, turned when the Bush administration started legitimising a potential operation in Iraq to inflict a regime change. On 26 September 2002, for example, 33 prominent (neo)realist scholars paid for an advertisement in the *New York Times* stating that the war with Iraq would not advance US national interests.<sup>366</sup> In other words, such a war would make the US less secure and could cause an increase in terrorist activities. It was not the idea of a war that the scholars were against, it was destabilising the Middle East that might put American interests in jeopardy. Despite the efforts of the academia as well as the military establishment, the US government chose to go to war against Iraq.

In terms of IR theory, US actions and the policies of the Bush administration were framed as a combination of pragmatic realism and Wilsonian liberalism, called "democratic realism" by some of its (neoconservative) proponents.<sup>367</sup> While thinking that the war in Iraq was against the US national interests, traditional American scholars reflected on the ongoing war and how it could be maintained in lines of national interests. These (neo)realists and (neo)liberals often expressed their views in journals

---

<sup>364</sup> "The 'Safe Haven' Myth," *Foreign Policy*, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/08/18/the-safe-haven-myth-2/>.

<sup>365</sup> Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Smart Power," *New Perspectives Quarterly* 26, no. 2 (2009): 8.

<sup>366</sup> These scholars were: Robert Art, Richard Betts, Dale Copeland, Michael Desch, Sumit Ganguly, Charles Glaser, Alexander George, Richard Herrmann, George Herring, Robert Jervis, Chaim Kaufmann, Carl Keyser, Elizabeth Kier, Deborah Larson, Jack Levy, Peter Liberman, John Mearsheimer, Steven Miller, Charles Moskos, Robert Pape, Barry Posen, Robert Powell, George Quester, Richard Rosecrance, Thomas Schelling, Randall Schweller, Glenn Snyder, Jack Snyder, Shibley Telhami, Stephen van Evera, Stephen Walt, Kenneth Waltz, and Cindy Williams. "War with Iraq Is Not in America's National Interest," *New York Times*, <http://www.bear-left.com/archive/2002/0926oped.html>.

<sup>367</sup> Louis Klarevas, "Political Realism: A Culprit for the 9/11 Attacks," *Harvard International Review* 26, no. 3 (2004): 19; Condoleezza Rice, "Rethinking the National Interest: American Realism for a New World," *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 4 (2008).

such as *Foreign Affairs*, *Foreign Policy*, and *The National Interest* in addition to mainstream academic journals like *International Security*.<sup>368</sup>

Some believed that the 11 September attacks occurred because the new Bush administration was oblivious to non-conventional threats as its policy was formulated along realist lines.<sup>369</sup> It was after the attacks and realisation of the new threats that liberal tones were added to foreign policy which can be easily traced in the rhetoric of “bringing democracy” to Iraq. The main debate, particularly after the first anniversary of the attacks, focused on the ‘grand strategy’ that the US needed to pursue. Many realists argued for offshore balancing which meant a very limited presence in the Middle East by delegating the responsibilities to local partners while having the option to re-engage if desired.

Despite the fact that the US received a certain amount of international support (especially from the UK), it still sought unilateral action with *ad hoc* coalitions instead of a multilateral approach. Therefore, liberal institutionalism was not an active part of this policy while the supposedly value-laden operation in Iraq was conducted without the approval and consent of the UN or other international organisations which in fact distanced continental Europe from the US.

Main points of the traditional analyses of the GWoT can be categorised under two headings, i.e. realist assumptions and liberal assumptions. Apart from the aforementioned particularities, realist assumptions provide a Cold War-like perspective. Firstly, in spite of acknowledging the threat of terrorist organisations, they still focus on the states. ‘States sponsoring terrorism’ or ‘rogue states’ concepts are good examples of this understanding. Secondly, pursuing self-interests is emphasised by the opposition against the war in Iraq. Thirdly, the hard power that is manifested through military and economic might is at the core of how national interests are

---

<sup>368</sup> For examples in addition to previously cited sources, see: Walt, "Beyond Bin Laden: Reshaping U.S. Foreign Policy."; Graham Allison and Andrei Kokoshin, "The New Containment: An Alliance against Nuclear Terrorism," *The National Interest* 69 (2002); G. John Ikenberry, "America's Imperial Ambition," *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 5 (2002); Joseph S. Nye Jr., "U.S. Power and Strategy after Iraq," *ibid.* 82, no. 4 (2003); "The Velvet Hegemon," *Foreign Policy* 136 (2003); Barry R. Posen, "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony," *International Security* 28, no. 1 (2003); Jack Snyder, "One World, Rival Theories," *Foreign Policy* 145 (2004); Philip H. Gordon, "Can the War on Terror Be Won? How to Fight the Right War," *Foreign Affairs* 86, no. 6 (2007); Robert Kagan, "The September 12 Paradigm: America, the World, and George W. Bush," *ibid.* 87, no. 5 (2008); Christopher Layne, "The Waning of U.S. Hegemony - Myth or Reality? A Review Essay," *International Security* 34, no. 1 (2009); John J. Mearsheimer, "Imperial by Design," *The National Interest* 111 (2011).

<sup>369</sup> Klarevas, 19.

achieved. For example, realist scholars discuss grand strategies which involve certain ways of projecting power through military but do not mention other possible avenues. They do not problematise the security logic and military response to terrorism. Finally, although international institutions have some merits, in the end, it is costly to seek a multilateral legitimacy as, in the final analysis, it is an anarchic system of every state for itself. Jervis, for example, analyses the US response to the 11 September and the following as the “Bush Doctrine” and argues that it was too ambitious and the means were not appropriate for the ends which were bringing stability to the Middle East.<sup>370</sup> Attention should be given here that no real cri

The Liberal story is naturally softer and takes into account several details that the realist assumptions ignore, however, in some aspects, it appears even more aggressive. Firstly, liberals understand that the states are not the only actors in the international system and the states do interact with these other actors. The 11 September attacks are an instance of this where a loosely-organised non-territorial terrorist organisation was able to inflict tremendous psychological and material damage to a superpower. Secondly, they emphasise the important role of multilateralism and cooperation. For example, seeking the approval of international community especially through the UN is seen as very crucial. Even though states may have certain interests they can be achieved in a more cost-effective way through international institutions. Thirdly, commitment to democratic values and human rights is essential for liberals. An extension of this is evident in the discussions regarding the ‘democratic peace thesis’ that was briefly discussed before. One radical interpretation of this is that if a non-democratic state is turned into a democracy then peace can be instated. Some argued that this was the motive behind the Iraq war as well as the humanitarian responsibility to free Iraqis from Saddam Hussein’s atrocities.<sup>371</sup> In such a view, however, state-building and peace-building needed to be planned in advance with clear objectives which the US did not have in Iraq. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, liberals focus on soft power (although Neorealists<sup>372</sup> also emphasise this sometimes)

---

<sup>370</sup> Robert Jervis, “Understanding the Bush Doctrine,” *Political Science Quarterly* 118, no. 3 (2003): 386.

<sup>371</sup> Jackson and Sorensen, 256-57.

<sup>372</sup> See: Robert A. Pape, “Soft Balancing against the United States,” *International Security* 30, no. 1 (2005); Stephen Van Evera, “Assessing U.S. Strategy in the War on Terror,” *The Annals of the American Academy* 607 (2006): 15-17.

and economics as drivers for change and cooperation. In this sense, to fight terrorism US needed to convince other actors and the populations in its benign intentions through economic and cultural influence and it seemed that Iraq war changed the positive views that were present after the 11 September attacks and the beginning of the Afghanistan campaign.

In the final analysis, traditional IR scholars focus on the aspects that their relevant assumptions allow them to do. There is no mention of domestic legislations that were enacted after the attacks, new institutions like the US Department of Homeland Security, or very little coverage of Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo or other sites of serious human rights violations. While some of them discuss the different perspectives in the US administration regarding the response, in the end, products do not go beyond policy recommendations and how to “win” the GWoT.

### **5.1.3. Critical Security Schools and the GWoT**

Critical security schools provided their own take on the subject, which was not picked up by the mainstream approaches. In the immediate aftermath of the attacks, Ken Booth and Tim Dunne edited the book *Worlds in Collision* that was comprised of articles from scholars of almost all perspectives in the academic IR.<sup>373</sup> This section will now scrutinise the three security schools through their responses (and non-responses) to the GWoT and show the intricate interconnections in their perceptions and cognition of events.

---

<sup>373</sup> Booth and Dunne, *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of the Global Order*.

### 5.1.3.1. Aberystwyth Theorises

I start with the Aberystwyth School not for an analytical reason but for the simple fact that it's the first one alphabetically. So, September 11 happened and the GWoT started but how it is perceived if you understand security as *emancipation*? For the ones that declared it, the reason behind the GWoT was, in one formulation, to secure the US and its allies. However, the picture can be seen in a slightly different light.

For the AS, because security is defined as *emancipation*, terrorism constitutes physical and psychological constraints for the victims and victims are mainly the civilians. Terror methods are not just composed of killing the civilian populations. The most important element is the invoked fear in the populations. Therefore, rather than the physical destructiveness of the act, the emotions it evokes are central.

Victim, however, is not a stable unchanging category. Victims of terrorist methods should be analysed on a case by case basis. When we look at domestic terrorism, meaning that the terrorists operating within a single state and for purposes exclusive to that state, victims can be individuals, communities, ethnic or religious groups, ideological groups, certain professions (i.e. civil servants or police), or totality of a population. For international terrorism, all these categories are valid but this time there is no demarcation based on state borders (i.e. ethnicity, religion, ideology etc).

For the AS, "terrorism is not a tactic but a strategic doctrine" that aim at invoking "fear beyond fear" to change the attitudes and behaviour of the relevant actors and very importantly it is not committed only against civilian targets<sup>374</sup>. So, then as an extension, it is the security of those which face the use of this strategic doctrine. In other words, victims (those who are terrorised) are the main referent objects.

It has been reiterated numerous times that in the AS framework security is actually equated with *emancipation*. Thus, any struggle against terrorism actually needs to be seen as a struggle to emancipate people from any kinds violent political

---

<sup>374</sup> Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, *Terror in Our Time* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), 20.

oppressions<sup>375</sup>. When struggle against terrorism becomes a struggle for *emancipation* it entails looking back at the consequences of counterterrorism which create another form of political violence<sup>376</sup>. Furthermore, some of the groups using terrorism claim that they are actually reacting against injustice, repression or aggression and representing the victims of such conduct.<sup>377</sup>

Accordingly, considering the effects of GWoT, in addition to the terrorised societies and direct victims of terrorism, people suffering because of the responses of GWoT itself are also significant. The legislations enacted following the 11 September attacks (i.e. the Patriot Act in the US and the amendments to the Terrorism Act 2000 in the UK) enabled governments to suspend fundamental rights and freedoms. The rhetoric on liberty and security balance led to the abandonment of rule of law and now “it sometimes seems as if people feel scared because they are protected rather than feel protected because they are scared.”<sup>378</sup>

Since the beginning of the GWoT, Western powers were eager to ignore human rights violations in antidemocratic regimes in exchange for intelligence and cooperation in counterterrorism efforts. The most striking examples were, of course, Libya and Egypt (although the 2011 Arab movements altered that situation drastically). Contrary to many commentators adhering to the mainstream perspectives as shown in the previous section, the GWoT and struggle for freedom had been inversely correlated.<sup>379</sup>

Then, whose security we are talking about? From the AS perspective, we are, in essence, talking about the security of all the people are oppressed; who needs to be emancipated from all kinds of fear and threat. In this respect, GWoT threatens the security of an ordinary Afghan farmer, a stockbroker in London, school children in Islamabad or a Sicilian fisherman. The list can include all sorts of people, soldier or civilian, politician or ‘terrorist’ and so forth. AS is talking about these peoples’ security.

---

<sup>375</sup> Ken Booth, "The Human Faces of Terror: Reflections in a Cracked Looking Glass," *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 1, no. 1 (2008): 77.

<sup>376</sup> Booth and Dunne, *Terror in Our Time*, 33.

<sup>377</sup> Ibid., 71.

<sup>378</sup> Booth and Dunne, *Terror in Our Time*, 161.

<sup>379</sup> Ibid., 147-48.

As *emancipation* is a universal aim, none can be exempted from it. A world where only the so-called Western people or only the so-called Muslim people are secure is simply not possible. It is a universal value and it should be AS's purpose.

Still, we must always keep in mind that "many democratic regimes owe their existence, in part, to successful campaigns of terror."<sup>380</sup> Not as a legitimization of use of terror but to understand how it is used and manipulated by all kinds of actors.

While discussing the AS with regard to terrorism it is essential to consider Critical Terrorism Studies (CTS) which is actually an offshoot of the AS itself. CTS was a research programme developed in the late 2000s by those who were dissatisfied with the orthodox terrorism studies and sought to reflect with a critical eye. With the launch of its flagship journal *Critical Studies in Terrorism* in 2008, it started to show a significant presence both in the security studies field and its subfield of terrorism studies. The criticality of the CTS is mainly based on the AS conception of security as *emancipation* and its projection towards the issue and concept of terrorism. They often refer to Ken Booth, and reiterate that security should "include all threats and obstacles to human actualisation, not merely those posed by political violence".<sup>381</sup> Through Richard Wyn Jones' 'concrete utopias' conceptualisation, the CTS views *emancipation* as a "process of continuous immanent critique" which aims at freeing people from numerous constraints.<sup>382</sup>

Obviously, targets of terrorism would like to be secure from terrorism and terrorists. Nevertheless, the question may not be that simple. The label terrorism refers to the methods employed by some groups that seek certain political objectives as the given definition implies. Therefore, in order to understand what the victims should be protected from, reasons and motivations behind the terrorist acts need to be scrutinised. It is easy and convenient to dismiss such aspects of terrorists acts, but this, in turn, results in symptomatic response rather than a comprehensive resolution.

---

<sup>380</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>381</sup> Marie Breen-Smyth, "A Critical Research Agenda for the Study of Political Terror," *European Political Science* 6, no. 6 (2007): 262.

<sup>382</sup> Richard Jackson, Marie Breen-Smyth, and Jeroen Gunning, "Critical Terrorism Studies: Framing a New Research Agenda," in *Critical Terrorism Studies: A New Research Agenda*, ed. Richard Jackson, Marie Breen-Smyth, and Jeroen Gunning (Abingdon: Routledge, 2009), 224.



Critical theories challenge the prevailing narratives and accordingly categorical structures such as the state.<sup>383</sup> AS, sees states as “necessary but flawed institutions” which are required for providing particular services, producing redistribution and welfare.<sup>384</sup> In connection with this understanding, the state’s role needs to be analysed as well. It is possible that the terrorist methods are being used because no alternative (political) avenues were left to the perpetrators. This explanation generally applies to ethnic or religious minorities (and sometimes to political ideologies that are banned) which opt for terror and guerrilla tactics for political recognition.

Once again we face a two-fold answer. On the one hand, as mainstream thinking dictates, it is security from the terrorists and their attacks and harm. On the other hand, motives for terrorism should be explored thoroughly so that it needs to be found out that whether the so-called terrorists are actually acting out of ‘other’ security concerns.

When security is defined as *emancipation*, the question becomes more about oppression and other constraints on freedom rather than just survival. In this regard, could the GWoT constitute an obstacle for *emancipation*? Do the practices within the framework of the GWoT push the world closer to *emancipation* or vice-versa?

Terror, defined as fear beyond fear, is itself a great obstacle for achieving *emancipation*.<sup>385</sup> So being free of this fear beyond fear is an important element of *emancipation*. This means, sensibly, terrorist acts are detrimental to security/*emancipation*. Nevertheless, the issue significantly changes form when we start to talk about the ‘terrorists’. The example given by Booth and Dunne is striking: Nobel Peace Prize winner, the first post-apartheid president of South Africa, the late Nelson Mandela was called a terrorist and incarcerated for 27 years but now championed as one of the greatest activists and freedom fighters.<sup>386</sup> So, ‘terrorist’ becomes a term of propaganda rather than an analytically useful one.<sup>387</sup> It is also possible that at some points in their existence individual or groups or states may resort to terrorism, but this does not make

---

<sup>383</sup> Booth, *Theory of World Security*, 186-86.

<sup>384</sup> Ibid., 205.

<sup>385</sup> Booth and Dunne, *Terror in Our Time*, 14.

<sup>386</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>387</sup> Ibid., 24.

them terrorists perpetually. Hence, the label is not very helpful other than putting some actors on the spot. As an extension, then, being emancipated from the label itself can be considered as security.

Another very central point in the AS theorising is ends-means dualism as explained in Chapter 4. This dualism plays a vital role in the analyses of the GWoT. The main problem is that a concrete end is envisaged such the end of al-Qaeda (or more broadly 'terror') and hence a military response is prioritised, however, in a non-dualistic critical point of view, there can be no end-points.<sup>388</sup> It will be dealt with more comprehensively, but it should be noted here that governments use moral justifications for their actions such as "fighting to protect the innocent from certain harm" while employing the very means they are against causing their means becoming incompatible with the ends.<sup>389</sup> Booth asks if the circumstances allowed Slobodan Milosevic to wait until after 11 September for his human rights atrocities, would NATO have gone to war in Serbia, or could they actually have made him an ally because of his position against the Islamic extremism of Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA).<sup>390</sup>

It is also noteworthy that while 'war' is usually seen as having an end at some point (i.e. victory or defeat), war on terrorism disrupts this understanding. If terrorism is a method, then it is not possible to win a war against a method. There is no concrete enemy but just a means. It is almost like declaring war on guerrilla tactics or single envelopment, you may win battles but the war rages on.

In the context of the GWoT, security from fear beyond fear is at the core. However, it has two levels as depicted above. One is the governments using the GWoT supposedly to ensure their citizens' security. The other one is security from both the terrorist acts and the consequences of them (including retaliatory attacks, illiberal practices, new legislature etc).

Physically speaking, terrorist attacks against infrastructures and supply routes for basic needs cause shortages that may threaten the very lives of the people. For example, burning of crops, sabotaging energy lines, poisoning water supplies and

---

<sup>388</sup> Ken Booth, "Two Terrors, One Problem," in *Globalization, Security, and the Nation-State: Paradigms in Transition*, ed. Ersel Aydinli and James N. Rosenau (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 46.

<sup>389</sup> Booth and Dunne, *Terror in Our Time*, 103.

<sup>390</sup> Booth, "Two Terrors, One Problem," 45.

similar acts negatively affects the livelihoods of many people. Psychologically, regardless of the extent of the physical damage, attacks cause an ever-continuing distress and fear that disrupts the daily lives. Fear (or terror) is a significant obstacle for freedom of the people who have been subjected to such acts.

The GWoT has caused many problems, many restraints and became a way of legitimisation of oppression. Terrorism itself is a security issue for the simple reason that fear beyond fear is one of the greatest constraints for human beings to realise themselves, not to mention the physical and psychological damage done to them through terrorist attacks. Nevertheless, the GWoT affirms injustices and cause cyclical violence where victims of the 'war' turn to terror strategies.<sup>391</sup> Moreover, illiberal practices exemplified by Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib as well as legislation (echoing sorts of states of emergency) caused more people to be affected and be less secure. As mentioned numerous times, suspension of fundamental rights and freedoms is a security issue in itself. It is one of the gravest obstacles for achieving *emancipation*.

It should also be recognised that the GWoT policies and terrorist responses cause another complex condition within the so-called Western societies. In the host communities, uncertainty and concerns feed extremism (i.e. Pegida in Germany) and Islamophobia in general, while immigrant communities feel patronised and the tensions also feed radicalisation.<sup>392</sup> This condition hints at possible avenues for AS-type scholarship. For example, instead of reproducing orthodox discourses, sources of grievances that lead to terrorist acts should be examined. This examination does not legitimise the violent methods, however, it would help to create a negotiating position. For this, AS argues that intellectuals and scholars should not refrain from 'speaking truth to power' as well as illuminating the public.<sup>393</sup>

A spiral of violence, particularly in the long run, would not accommodate the demands of both sides. In the final analysis, *emancipation*/security can only be approached when fears and constraints are eliminated. This elimination cannot be achieved through continuous violence. Good Friday Agreement finalising the peace

---

<sup>391</sup> Booth and Dunne, *Terror in Our Time*, 7.

<sup>392</sup> Ibid., 163.

<sup>393</sup> Wyn Jones, *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory*; "The Test of Practice: An Interview with Richard Wyn Jones," in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies: Interviews and Reflections*, ed. Shannon Brincat, Laura Lima, and João Nunes (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), 93.

process in Ireland, and the recent accord between the FARC (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia—People's Army) and the president of Colombia can be considered as examples of emancipatory politics.

GWoT was from the start conducted very problematically. Instead of putting rule of law as the primary principle for dealing with suspects and prisoners, the response to 11 September was the opposite.<sup>394</sup> It has been asserted that “a war is only as good as the peace that follows it” and obviously there is yet to be a peace.<sup>395</sup>

The AS believes that a different future is possible. The main problem with the contemporary part of the GWoT is continuation of the politics of business-as-usual as the realists favoured conventional security instruments and borders following the attacks (even though they resisted the invasion of Iraq) resulting in an increase of fears and feelings of insecurity.<sup>396</sup> Critical theorists, on the other hand, are proponents of building a new global culture without the dualistic thinking that has been dominating the world order.<sup>397</sup> What we should do, according to the AS, is basically learning to feel and admit that we are all equal human beings instead of seeing each other in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender, or religion so that all can enjoy differences and institutionalise cosmopolitan equality.<sup>398</sup> It is through a non-dualistic response that an ethical and law-governed response to the GWoT is possible.<sup>399</sup>

The role of academics is very important for the AS. It is because praxis is the profession of an academic; s/he needs to speak to many audiences and going against the common beliefs is her/his business which can be done through teaching, conducting research and serving society.<sup>400</sup> ‘Speaking truth to power’, however, caused some unexpected consequences for CTS scholarship. Whilst trying to be agents of change and critical reflection, scholars became part of the very structures that they

---

<sup>394</sup> Booth, *Theory of World Security*, 436-37.

<sup>395</sup> Ibid., 305.

<sup>396</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>397</sup> Booth and Dunne, *Terror in Our Time*, 47.

<sup>398</sup> Ken Booth, "Changing Global Realities: Critical Theory for Critical Times," *Spectrum Journal of Global Studies* 1, no. 2 (2009): 55.

<sup>399</sup> "Two Terrors, One Problem," 46.

<sup>400</sup> "The Human Faces of Terror: Reflections in a Cracked Looking Glass," 66-69.

were against. As Jackson's harsh self-critique shows, instead of working towards *emancipation* CTS scholars became contributors to the counter-terrorism regime that depended on orthodox understandings, methods, and violent outcomes.<sup>401</sup>

Objectivity should also be rejected but a critical distance is always important.<sup>402</sup> In this vein, a critical distance has been attempted in this section when trying to re-tell the story. There is a number of ways that academics can contribute to different extents. Perhaps the most effective one, especially in short-term, is teaching.<sup>403</sup> Another way is using the social media and expressing ideas through blogs and similar media.<sup>404</sup> The rest is more broad, diffuse, and long-term but still would make a political impact by changing human consciousness towards an emancipatory perception.<sup>405</sup> Trying to communicate with different audiences, particularly civil society actors, is one of the essential points for translating theory into practice.<sup>406</sup> In terms of the GWoT, however, the AS has not proposed more concrete ways except the general ways described above. What should be done is, therefore, an interpretation of the role of the critical theorist as an agent for political impact. This can be achieved by writing, speaking, teaching and constantly questioning the prevailing orders illustrating the ways the GWoT has been blocking the avenues for an emancipatory cosmopolitan project.

To sum up, AS interprets terrorism as a method and its investigations of the GWoT are based on this understanding. The security-as-*emancipation* formulation leads to analyses based on victimhood and constraints that prevent freeing of peoples globally. Therefore, the AS tells the story of different victims, causes, and grievances. While condemning terrorist methods, the AS believes that political aims can be reached through politicisation and in extension deliberation. Paradoxically, however, policy

---

<sup>401</sup> Richard Jackson, "To Be or Not to Be Policy Relevant? Power, *Emancipation* and Resistance in Cts Research," *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 9, no. 1 (2016).

<sup>402</sup> Ibid., 72; Booth, *Theory of World Security*, 236-37.

<sup>403</sup> "Challenging the Ideas That Made Us: An Interview with Ken Booth," in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies: Interviews and Reflections*, ed. Shannon Brincat, Laura Lima, and João Nunes (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), 79.

<sup>404</sup> "The Test of Practice: An Interview with Richard Wyn Jones," in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies: Interviews and Reflections*, ed. Shannon Brincat, Laura Lima, and João Nunes (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), 100.

<sup>405</sup> "Challenging the Ideas That Made Us: An Interview with Ken Booth," 79.

<sup>406</sup> "The Test of Practice: An Interview with Richard Wyn Jones," 94.

relevance and attempts at speaking truth to power in the framework of CTS reified the prevailing methods for countering terrorism, particularly through violence. It can be argued that the AS's assessment of the GWoT circled around possibilities of policy relevance, agency, and critique but unfortunately was not very effective. Although one can claim that the mainstream perspectives were not effective, it is safe to say that the mainstream scholarship (despite their own problems) were very much part of the GWoT policy-making circles in line with their theoretical underpinnings.

### 5.1.3.2. Copenhagen Theorises

The Copenhagen School's understanding includes a sectoral approach that has been explained in the previous chapter. In terms of the sectoral divisions within the CS's approach, it is possible to say that there are around five main referent objects. But also when the literature on the GWoT is analysed there seem to be certain referent objects that are given more attention. Criticism of state-centrism is perfectly applicable here, yet the focus on a state's securitisation practices is easier to locate and illustrate. Therefore, present analyses do not rule out other referent objects altogether. It should be kept in mind that the sectoral approach is more of an analytical tool to reveal different patterns of interaction between referent objects as well as actors involved.<sup>407</sup>

The central focus regarding the post-11 September condition and the GWoT is the way immigrants and asylum-seekers are securitised.<sup>408</sup> Since the reception of speech-acts by the audience and acceptance is one of the most important features of securitisation, it is safe to say that attacks on 11 September and the subsequent GWoT, plus the further attacks in London, Madrid, Bali, and Istanbul allowed speech-acts securitising migration to be easily accepted.<sup>409</sup> George W. Bush's speech declaring the GWoT and the following support he got from foreign governments (including Russia)

---

<sup>407</sup> Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde, 8.

<sup>408</sup> McDonald, "Constructivism," in *Security Studies: An Introduction*, ed. Paul D. Williams (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008).

<sup>409</sup> Fierke, 104-05.

and later on the UN is a good example of this. Bush's speeches and statements that were introduced in the GWO'T description section are very significant instances of speech acts that have become successful and effective securitisations.

But again 'whose security?' This depends on who the securitising actor is, what s/he's aiming at as well as who the audience is. State security can be of importance in one case but another aspect can bring the citizen of these states into the equation. Because the terror attacks essentially hurt individual citizens, one cannot ignore the individual security of the people who are subjected to attacks. This, however, is not expressed loudly within the CS. It seems that in the framework of the GWO'T, the CS is mainly concerned with how the states (particularly the Western states) securitise elements that might be related to terrorism. In a boarder understanding the GWO'T was staged as "a macrosecuritisation with the whole of the 'civilized' world (that is, the West and its hangers-on), and its principles of freedom, democracy, the market and openness as the referent objects."<sup>410</sup> According to Buzan and Wæver 'macrosecuritisation' means a securitisation of categorically larger entities such as ideologies, religions, or international institutions.<sup>411</sup> It is not clear, however, the reason another concept is needed apart from 'securitisation' itself.

Another point regarding the 'whose security' question and the GWO'T is economic underdevelopment. Based on an argument that extremism is bred by economic problems, financial assistance and foreign aid became important in fighting terrorism.<sup>412</sup> This implies, to some extent, that economic security (economic sector) of the people in less developed countries can also be thought of as a referent object.

It is imperative to remember that in the CS approach security is a negative concept. It is negative in the sense that when an issue is securitised it is considered to be an existential threat. Terrorism, then, constitutes an existential threat almost in all of the sectors, albeit at different extents, in different forms, and for different reasons.

---

<sup>410</sup> Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, "Macrosecuritisation and Security Constellations: Reconsidering Scale in Securitisation Theory," *Review of International Studies* 35, no. 02 (2009): 273.

<sup>411</sup> Ibid., 257.

<sup>412</sup> Rita Abrahamsen, "Blair's Africa: The Politics of Securitization and Fear," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 30, no. 1 (2005).

Terrorism may threaten certain identities, the *we-feeling* of groups. There are different levels to the identity. Consider the example of Turkey and Kurds in Turkey. 'Turkish' national identity is constructed constitutionally through supra-identity (based on citizenship), meaning that it encompasses more than one ethnic identity.<sup>413</sup> Although in theory, all the sub-groups are equal before the law as they share Turkish supra-identity, in practice Kurds are prevented from being promoted after certain positions, particularly in the army. Years after a political struggle they are even barred from participating in politics (until very recently) and suppressed through unjust and violent means, in turn, they decide to take up arms for their rights and freedoms. They might use terror tactics to make themselves heard and gain leverage for a settlement. Here the attackers are the terrorists and threaten the rest of the population. When seen from the government's perspective and the rest of the population who believe that the supra-identity provides unity, security from these separatist terrorists is the main issue. However, when seen from the other side, the armed group is actually trying to secure the members of their ethnicity from the suppression by the dominant groups. Similar examples can be seen with respect to the Basque in Spain and IRA in the UK.

The central theme in the CS regarding the GWoT is undoubtedly security from the 'terrorists' or 'international terrorism'.<sup>414</sup> Apart from this apparent 'threat' however we can pinpoint an argument regarding identities. The '*Us vs them*' distinction is present in the securitising moves initiated within the GWoT. While in the official rhetoric actors refrained from securitising Islam, a terrorist who claims to be Muslims were targeting the 'Western' way of life and freedoms. It is a civilisational macrosecuritisation where the 'civilised world' was under threat.<sup>415</sup> The measures are taken, however, show a far more complex situation.

The securitisation of immigrants and asylum-seekers constructed a reality where terrorism and immigration became closely associated. In a sense, the GWoT produced a new threat that easily resonated with the audiences. The main answer to

---

<sup>413</sup> Constitution of Turkey Article 66 says that "Everyone bound to the Turkish State through the bond of citizenship is a Turk." "Constitution of the Republic of Turkey," Turkish Grand National Assembly, [https://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution\\_en.pdf](https://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution_en.pdf).

<sup>414</sup> Particularly seen through the analyses of Balzacq and his collaborators focusing on the EU: Thierry Balzacq and Sergio Carrera, eds., *Security Versus Freedom?: A Challenge for Europe's Future* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

<sup>415</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 272.



the question then, as Buzan and Wæver imply, security from the enemies of “principles of freedom, democracy, the market, and openness”.<sup>416</sup>

Terrorism constitutes an existential threat which requires measures outside the common political and public sphere. Therefore, terrorism becomes an issue that does not allow for opposing views to debate, rather it requires a unified approach. If the threat is mainly against the military, then the response would involve solely the military and it would become a national security issue. The methods themselves call for a state-sponsored response since according to the Weberian notion of the modern nation-state, only the state has the monopoly of violence. Conceptually securitisation of terrorism after the GWoT is almost a self-referential process, meaning that the speech acts for the securitisation of various issues actually involve utterances of or references to ‘terrorism’. Therefore, if something is deemed related to terrorism then it becomes automatically a security issue. It is easy for actors (mainly state elites) to point out the perpetrators and seek a rally-around-the-flag effect that would take the issue directly from any public debate.

Ethnic or religious terrorism seeks to establish or assert a certain identity, locally or internationally. In this vein, we can talk about a clash of identities. One identity is the victim’s which depending on the narrative of the terrorist groups can be the oppressor or exploiter. In contrast, the terrorist group may see itself as the freedom fighter which had no avenues for a civilian political movement and thus took up arms. Here it can be seen that there are two societies whose identities are at stake. Terrorists, while trying to make a political statement to ensure the security of the society they belong to, threaten and damage the other society through their violent methods. From the military, as well as political sectors, terrorism threatens the unity of the state.

In essence, something is a security issue because it has been securitised. In other words, because it is represented as a ‘security’ issue. Terrorism constitutes an existential threat which requires measures outside the common political and public sphere. Therefore, terrorism becomes an issue that does not allow for opposing views to debate, rather it requires a unified approach. The Patriot Act in the United States and the amendments to the Terrorism Act in the United Kingdom are significant

---

<sup>416</sup> Ibid., 273.

examples regarding this. Terrorism which was a criminal issue prior to the GWoT is now considered as both national and international security matter.<sup>417</sup>

The CS's central aim is to show the security dynamics rather than commenting on them. Nevertheless, they see securitisation as a mainly negative process and hence favour policies of desecuritisation. This may result in a deeper political discussion concerning the reasons behind the terrorist acts and perhaps lead to peace processes mentioned in the AS school part of the hypothetical case. Another possibility is criminalisation of terrorism which would take it outside the realm of security practices and downgrade it to criminal justice issue.

When GWoT is regarded as a macrosecuritisation, the CS argues that it should be analysed thoroughly rather than providing concrete ways out of potential pitfalls.<sup>418</sup> It is also very interesting and important that we do not see many analyses from or of the CS that give a satisfactory answer. As with the concept of terrorism itself, an alternative could be re-criminalising terrorism restoring it to the pre-GWoT stance within the 'security' frameworks. Furthermore, perhaps most urgently what should be done is to desecuritize immigration and asylum-seeking. The current refugee crisis and the reactions to it (such as the agreement between the EU and Turkey) are an extension of the securitised nature of the issue which intensified as a part of the GWoT.

It is interesting that the CS itself has not been very vocal about the GWoT and developments that are related, although there are some significant contributions. Buzan mainly explored the possibility of the GWoT becoming a new Cold War utilising the securitisation theory and claimed that the GWoT had become a successful macrosecuritisation, however, it is very improbable that it will become the next Cold War.<sup>419</sup> Considering that the GWoT is seemingly over (as declared by Obama) Buzan seems to be right, but if we look deeper into practices (as will be explored in the Paris School section) the verdict may not be that easy. Balzacq has focused on the EU

---

<sup>417</sup> Fierke, 108.

<sup>418</sup> Buzan and Wæver, 274-76..

<sup>419</sup> Barry Buzan, "Will the 'Global War on Terrorism' Be the New Cold War?," *International Affairs* 82, no. 6 (2006): 1103-06, 15.

interior and exterior policies to pinpoint tools that have used for securitisation.<sup>420</sup> He argues that the tools for EU's counter-terrorism strategy cause de-politicisation, intelligence-led policing and dense information sharing between different organs.<sup>421</sup> These processes cause an amplified emphasis on security as non-politics and the EU becomes a policy enforcer without deliberative politics. It is also argued, for example by Salter, imaginaries are securitised as part of the GWoT to underline risk through the images in the popular culture and terror narratives.<sup>422</sup> A similar position can be seen in Hansen's examination of the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis of 2005 in which a series of cartoons were published by the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* that depicted Muhammad ibn Abdullah, the founder of Islam, and caused international controversy.<sup>423</sup> This visual securitisation can be argued to be a product of the sentiments that have grown after the 11 September attacks and actually a part of the GWoT itself. Hansen shows that the securitisation began by 11 diplomats deeming cartoons to be a part of the anti-Islamic sentiment in Denmark and Europe, and then visibility of cartoons made it easy to circulate internationally causing violent reactions.<sup>424</sup>

To sum up, the CS captures the dynamics of the GWoT effectively in the sense that it allows us to trace speech acts and securitisations. It is not an exaggeration to say that the GWoT itself began with a speech act that had been received positively globally and terrorism became a security issue, an existential threat to almost everyone. This also allowed counter speech acts from the terrorists who were able to recruit more operatives through their articulation of existential threats and unity against total destruction of Muslims. The CS, in this sense, is very useful for understanding what kind of dynamics are at play when security policies and relevant legislations are enacted. Another strength of the CS comes from its ability to be actually included in mainstream

---

<sup>420</sup> Thierry Balzacq, "The Policy Tools of Securitization: Information Exchange, Eu Foreign and Interior Policies," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46, no. 1 (2008).

<sup>421</sup> Ibid., 92-96.

<sup>422</sup> Mark B. Salter, "Risk and Imagination in the War on Terror," in *Risk and the War on Terror*, ed. Lousie Amoore and Marieke de Goede (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), 234-41.

<sup>423</sup> Lene Hansen, "Theorizing the Image for Security Studies: Visual Securitization and the Mohammad Cartoon Crisis," *European Journal of International Relations* 17, no. 1 (2011).

<sup>424</sup> Ibid., 66-67.

analyses because it depicts the relationship between national interest rhetoric and securitisation. The mainstream views, however, would not, of course, want desecuritisation until it is very essential for national security. The main criticality of the CS lies in its attempt to deconstruct how security is enacted, how the discourse is established and accepted by audiences. Therefore, it opens avenues for responding to illiberal, undemocratic or other various practices that have been enabled by securitisations. Concepts and phenomena like migration, immigration, refugees, borders, policing, non-places, and so forth which increasingly became securitised during and because of the GWoT need to be brought back to non-emergency politics and desecuritised. The majority of works focusing on securitisation regarding the GWoT, however, were produced by the Paris School.

#### **5.1.3.3. Paris Theorises**

Since security is understood as a ‘technique of government’ by the PS, the central referent objects seem to be the security bureaucracy and the governments. This technique or ‘governmentality’ is based on maintaining a degree of fear which in turn makes the modes of governing, bureaucratic arrangements and institutions elementary. This process of insecuritisation causes individuals as well as societies to feel insecure and support the measures taken by that field of security professionals. As a continuation of this logic, it can be deduced that it is actually the security of the security field itself. It is the survival of the established modes of governmentality that is at stakes. As a result, the acceptability of threats are raised by the security professionals and people are put into a perpetual state of insecurity<sup>425</sup>. If the field is a part of the referent objects, then by extension, habitus of the security professionals can be challenged. In a more ontological level, challenged habitus threatens the field and everything related to the field. In the European Security case, the field is about the production of truth as mentioned previously. So, in a sense, ‘truth’ can also be

---

<sup>425</sup> Balzacq.

challenged by terrorism. For example, cyberterrorism and even mainstream terrorism might be outcry against the prevalent policies and/or narratives.

There is, however, a positive security understanding in the PS as well. The one explored above was what the PS has been observing, what the phenomenal security or the practice has been. Normative security in the PS framework mentions the protection of the weakest from oppression, suppression and other fundamental threats (i.e. injustice, exploitation, discrimination etc) for the well-being of these people.<sup>426</sup>

In the final analysis, then, there are two levels of referent objects in the PS. One is the field that uses the securitisation to ensure its continuity and the second is the weak people who are suppressed, perhaps even by the field professionals themselves as can be seen in the case of the rhetoric in which immigrant became almost synonymous with terrorist.<sup>427</sup>

When security is understood as a device or a technique of government, conventional questions such as 'whose security' seems to become irrelevant. Nevertheless, the question is very significant, especially for analytical purposes. While trying to answer, we must also consider whether security is perceived as something positive or negative. It has been shown that the PS has focused on security practices as employed by the so-called security professionals. It is even argued that security is a set of practices itself. Therefore to makes sense the of the GWO'T through the PS lens, it is imperative to understand *dispositifs*, *habitus*, and the *field*.

If security is a set of practices that are employed by agents in the field and if one of the central tenets is the survival and continuation of the field, it would logically indicate that the main referent object is the field and by extension the agents within the field whose *habitus* creates the field itself. In the case of GWO'T determining the agents' workings in the fields would be useful to understand the struggle between the agents and their pursuit of survival and then power. European integration, in particular, provides an extensive example of a field where internal and external security practices converge. This convergence includes police forces (i.e. national, Europol, Interpol), intelligence agencies of different sorts (i.e. police intelligence, military intelligence, civilian intelligence etc.), other intergovernmental agencies and institutions regarding

---

<sup>426</sup> Bigo, "Internal and External Aspects of Security."

<sup>427</sup> "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease."

immigration (i.e. EASO, Schengen Agreement, etc.). In addition to these, national and international bureaucracies, some NGOs, and experts (i.e. advisers, academics) are usually part of the field as well. The field, as in its definition, share the *habitus* and through these homogenised practices reproduces itself. The field becomes powerful and necessary if not indispensable. At the same time, however, to maintain relevance agencies compete to produce ‘truth’ as practice and/or develop governmentality.

GWoT has been instrumental in homogenising the field. Terrorism was the defined threat/enemy, yet what constituted terrorism was problematic which allowed (in)securitisation practices to evolve and become more comprehensive. For example, CCTV surveillance has become a part of our daily lives so much that when CCTV cameras malfunction where a ‘crime’ occurs citizens react strongly. Even though ‘criminalisation’ of migration started before the declaration of GWoT, through the practices and legislation within the framework of GWoT that new ‘truths’ regarding connections between (in)migration and terrorism has been established.

When the problem is defined within the parameters of (in)securitisation practices, we need to remember that security is a negative concept. In this vein, we come across a two-dimensional characteristic. On the one hand, there is the more or less conventional aspect of “survival as security” regarding the field and the security professionals. On the other hand, (in)securitisation practices pose problems for certain groups. For instance, anti-terror measures introduced during the GWoT that complicate even leisure visits to some countries, cause greater problems for members of certain groups (i.e. ethnicities, nationalities, religions). In particular, visits to the Middle East and North Africa countries or people coming from these countries visiting Europe or North America become flagged issues.

Firstly, terrorism is a very useful concept for the security professionals. It enables them to maintain their existence and allows them to link everything with terrorism while paving way for an increase in surveillance technologies. Fundamental freedoms can easily be suspended on the basis of measures taken against terrorism. Certain groups, religions, ideologies can be put under extra surveillance or even gathered as usual suspects. All these practices ensure the necessity and vitality of security institutions and professionals. In short, terrorism becomes an umbrella term

to encompass anything to maintain securitisation. As such, security from losing relevance and usefulness is ensured.

Secondly, when our referent object becomes the oppressed people security from/what question becomes a deeper one. One must look into who or what causes injustice, exploitation, marginalisation, discrimination, violation of human rights and so forth. Conceptually, terrorism can both be the direct and indirect cause. Directly, terror methods would inevitably cause discrimination and violation of human rights as they are violent and generally directed towards a certain group or strata. On the other hand, indirectly terrorism leads to certain measures to be taken by the security professionals which include the suspension of fundamental rights and freedoms, increased surveillance, profiling and sometimes even state of emergency. Groups of certain features such as immigrants, ethnic or religious minorities, or people favouring radical ideologies (from the perspective of the powerful of course) become easy targets for intelligence professionals and law enforcement (who are among the aforementioned security professionals), more than often mobs. Particularly, suspension of rights and being targeted by extreme (usually right-wing) groups create grievances that may lead to sympathy towards the terrorist organisations. It may cause a spiral of violence and perpetual state of exception.

There is no exhaustive and universally accepted list of terrorist groups, and no definition has been agreed upon globally. Accordingly, while the actions of a certain individual or group are considered as terrorist by some actors, the other might not agree upon such a categorisation. Nevertheless, the act itself may be seen as committed by terrorist methods. This would also enable the inclusion of states using terrorist methods within or outside their borders. But the question still remains: Could it be objectively decided whether an armed conflict is terrorism, insurgency, retaliation, preemptive measure, civil war, occupation, or (humanitarian) intervention? Surely, there are definitions for each of these situations in the literature, however, that literature itself is also shaped by the *field*, and the *habitus*.

Security and survival of the field and the professionals make it seem like the importance lies in the security of them. Nevertheless, PS is actually a critique of the existing practices and (in)securitisation. The term security may have been used to justify the practices of particular professionals, but security is an element of democracy without the rhetoric of emergency. As explained previously, it is through “protection

of the weakest against injustice, exploitation, and marginalisation” security assumes a real meaning and ensures social security, rule of law, guarantee against discrimination.<sup>428</sup> In this respect, there is a normative aspect of PS which argues for the security of individuals/citizens. In other words, we face the two-dimensional characteristic here as well. In the analysis of the praxis, security professionals try to secure themselves and their professions through instigating unease and feeling insecurity among others. Whereas in the critique it implies that the main problem is the insecurity itself and people need to be free from that unease.

Surveillance technologies, new immigration and/or citizenship legislations increasingly interfere with the privacy of citizens. Possible threats are articulated so that people would feel insecure and allow their privacy to be violated in exchange for security. However, perfect security would also mean that the security professionals are no longer required. Especially by utilising surveillance techniques and necessity rhetoric feelings of unease and insecurity are maintained. Depending on the country and the severity of threat perceptions, criticising such measure may be equated with treason or sympathising with the terrorists.

Based on the PS's formulation in terms of the practice of insecurity, terrorism is a security issue because it is used as the legitimating reason behind the security practices. As explained above, many issues from immigration to unemployment, from energy crises to economic instability can be linked and articulated with terrorism for supporting modes of governing uncertainty and risk. 'Diffuse securitising', in the words of Jef Huysmans, is reflected in everyday practices when ordinary people inadvertently link issues as delivered for them. Therefore, conditions that seem unrelated can be connected and bundled with security perceptions.

In the second understanding, it is a security issue because the referent objects are not protected against injustice, discrimination, oppression or suppression. Furthermore, attacks that use terror methods unravel the previous protection (if they were present at all). Last but not least physical harm caused by the terrorist attacks on civilians are self-evidently security issues.

GWoT has affected numerous actors related to the security field as explained before. Then, the GWoT itself is a security issue as it is used as the legitimating reason

---

<sup>428</sup> Bigo, "Internal and External Aspects of Security," 402.



behind security practices. It has become the discourse that allowed development of new agencies, legislation and so forth. It enabled the creation of the contemporary security field with its own agendas. GWoT has become the perfect catch phrase for governing uncertainty and risk. It penetrated the lives of almost everyone in the modern society. It is reminiscent of the practices of illiberal societies where a threat such as terrorism is used as strengthening allegiance. Furthermore, 'diffuse securitising' is reflected in everyday practices when ordinary people inadvertently link issue as delivered for them. Therefore, even a condition like unemployment can be connected to terrorism (through immigration for example) and thus create a diffused link of risks making everything seem to be security issues.

Another dimension of the issue, which is also an extension of the measures taken, is that GWoT has caused radicalisation of certain groups and it can be argued that the Islamic State (ISIS) is a direct or indirect consequence of the GWoT. Increasing xenophobia and rise of far right are other examples that can be easily connected to the modes of governance within the GWoT.

In its simplest terms, PS claims that security should be freed from the politicians' and security professionals' realm of self-interest.<sup>429</sup> This is actually a challenge towards the field of security. Only if the prevailing understandings and structures of the field are shaken and perhaps deconstructed, then a positive security agenda can be put forward. In other words, sedimented institutional networks and bureaucracies are required to be unmade. It is possible that certain terrorist groups would give up these methods if there are sufficient ways for them to express political dissent and grievances. Some groups like the Islamic State, however, may not disappear as they have totalising global ideology.

Although the GWoT officially ended on 23 May 2013, Obama administration rarely used the term and the official name of the operations was changed to "Overseas Contingency Operation" in 2009.<sup>430</sup> It is notable that especially following the killing of Osama Bin Laden in 2011 it seemed like the war was over. US withdrawal from Iraq and Afghanistan were also indicative of this, however, in the framework of the PS, it

---

<sup>429</sup> Ibid.

<sup>430</sup> Scott Wilson and Al Kamen, "'Global War on Terror' Is Given New Name," *The Washington Post*, March 25 2009.

is not the actual war we are concerned with but the security practices that began to be implemented during the period and maintained even today. Although a thorough new research is required to see the spill over of the security practices it would not be speculative to claim that the most of the practices are still maintained and the field continues to reproduce itself. An interesting example is the enactment of the USA Freedom Act (2015) which restores some elements of the Patriot Act such as authorisation for roving wiretaps and tracking lone wolf terrorists.

To sum up, the PS looks at terrorism and GWoT through a lens that allows it to pinpoint practices which govern the security field. In a sense, it is an expansion of the CS to include practices which are not always as visible as speech acts. The bureaucratic elements and homogenisation of internal and external security apparatus depict how an insecuritisation process gained speed and dominated through the GWoT. Therefore, PS can be accepted as the deepening of the CS through a praxis-oriented analysis. Accordingly, it depicts how the fields emerge and converge and governed through certain mentalities. This, in turn, provides a very detailed picture if and when combined with the AS and the CS. It important to realise that despite focusing on practices and their analysis just like the CS, the PS also has an implicit normative aspect. It is a position against the present order and governmentality which changed the meaning of security and put risk and fear as the foremost concern allowing to maintain itself indefinitely. Therefore, in the final analysis, the PS is emancipatory because it seeks protection of the weakest, social security, rule of law, guarantees against discrimination. The GWoT is the perfect antithesis for such an understanding.

## **5.2. Philosophical Links and the GWoT**

I have briefly shown how the mainstream IR scholarship dealt with the 11 September attacks and the subsequent GWoT. Then, re-tellings of three critical security schools were provided to understand how they respond to an event or a phenomenon that is very much related to their academic interest. Now, it is time to

investigate and analyse the connections between these schools as well as their philosophical backgrounds in the emancipatory thought of Enlightenment that have been explained in the previous chapters. Since the concept of *emancipation* is at the core of this dissertation's main argument, it would be suitable to explore the connections through *emancipation* and then reflect on the philosophical underpinnings.

If we return to the discussion of Kant at the beginning of this dissertation, we would recall his essay on Enlightenment. Kant himself was able to realise the temporality and locality of himself within history. Thus, when answering the question "What is Enlightenment?", he emphasised humanity's development and improvement:

"Enlightenment is the human being's *emancipation* from its self-incurred immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to make use of one's intellect without the direction of another. This immaturity is self-incurred when its cause does not lie in a lack of intellect, but rather in a lack of resolve and courage to make use of one's intellect without the direction of another. 'Sapere aude! Have the courage to make use of your own intellect!' is hence the motto of enlightenment"<sup>431</sup>

There may have been aspects lost in translation or some extra connotations may be present in this English rendering, however, this still captures the main meaning behind Kant's response. It, in a sense, encompasses the Enlightenment thought as a whole. Therefore, the *emancipation* of minds leads to a deeper and broader liberation whereby human beings themselves take control of their lives. While *the* Enlightenment refers to a specific era in time (and space as well), 'enlightenment' is a process of *emancipation* without a final point. In this sense, critical philosophy that came into being through Kant's critiques inherited this normative worldview.

A brief timeline has been depicted in chapters 2 and 3 regarding how Kantian philosophy evolved into other forms such as Critical Theory and in another branch of poststructuralism and critical sociology. The manifestations of these processes and developments are very much present in the critical security schools albeit implicitly in some cases. It is, however, possible to reveal this relationship now that I have explored

---

<sup>431</sup> Immanuel Kant, "An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment?," in "*Toward Perpetual Peace*" and *Other Writings on Politics, Peace, and History*, ed. Pauline Kleingeld (Binghamton: Yale University Press, 2006), 17.

the philosophical backgrounds, three critical schools themselves, and finally the way schools approached a contemporary phenomenon.

In the AS, the role of *emancipation* is very central, thus it does not need any more elaboration: Security is *emancipation* and this is a process which cannot be fully attained but only progressed towards. Agency is at the core and intellectuals have roles to play to speak a different truth to power and empowering people so that they can be emancipated. One must be careful here. Intellectuals are not the emancipators here, people emancipate themselves but intellectuals and other activists play a role in strengthening the civil society as well as trying to convince those in power regarding present constraints. In the case of GWoT, the AS was not successful in creating change towards *emancipation*. The self-critique of the CTS scholars is an important example of this and shows that they may have even inhibited emancipatory politics while engaging in counter-terrorism policies. This means that a different approach towards agency for change is required.

The CS is not an essentially normative approach. It actually tries to construct a framework to analyse how things are given meaning as security and their main tool for this is securitisation theory. Speech acts transform issues into existential threats so that they are put out of the regular political realm and measures can be taken accordingly in a security realm. The normative and emancipatory part actually lies in the negative understanding of security in the CS. As opposed to the AS's positive security-as-*emancipation* approach, CS argues that securitisation is a hindrance to (democratic) politics. Therefore, desecuritisation is the desired condition. Instead of making things disappear from the public discussion they need to be part of public deliberations. This means that the main problem with securitisation is actually the politics of emergency that is invoked. Dissolving the state of exception and emergency politics is essentially an emancipatory act. Thus, it is not far-fetched to argue that the CS's call for desecuritisation is emancipatory in the sense that it frees people from the constraints formed through securitisation. In the GWoT case, it was exemplified in detail through anti-terror legislations, new citizenship laws, and securitisation of immigration numerous new constraints have been constructed. A return to normal politics thus will be emancipatory in its core.

It has been argued that the PS is an enhanced and deepened version of the CS that is not solely focused on speech acts but also other practices. Therefore, in the first

instance, like the CS it only seems to be an analytical framework that uses Foucauldian and Bourdieusian elements. Nevertheless, just like the CS, it has an implicit normative core. Firstly it criticises the practices of the security field and its habitus. It shows how the bureaucracies and institutions are intertwined domestically and internationally. These aim to maintain their existence and survival, thus they need threats to show they are still required. This causes insecurity and governance through risk. In other words, the PS shows how insecurity feeling is invoked in populations in order to ensure the field remains intact. While the GWOI, helped the creation of this field through many institutions and new practices, once it was created it had a life of its own. The security field, therefore, has blossomed through the GWOI and even created its own jurisprudence. If threats that the field is attempting to counter cease to exist, then there will be no reason for the field as it is today. Terrorism, in this sense, is very useful because even though the GWOI is over, it is always possible to invoke the fears of terrorist attacks in the contemporary moods and psychologies of the peoples. The structure of the field and habitus are significant elements that enact numerous constraints. As claimed earlier, according to the PS security should be freed from the politicians' and security professionals' realm of self-interest. This calls for a deconstruction or at least disruption of the field with emancipatory intent. While it seems that security is a negative concept, essentially for the PS it should not be negative it should be part of democracy. As formulated above only through "protection of the weakest against injustice, exploitation, and marginalisation" security assumes a real meaning and ensures social security, rule of law, guarantee against discrimination. This is nothing more than *emancipation*.

In the final analysis, the three critical security schools aim at *emancipation*. This *emancipation* is both enlightenment and comes from *the* Enlightenment. With *emancipation* at their core, it is possible to regard these schools as complementary perspectives which are essentially deeply connected. What is needed is actually a re-formulation of the research agenda that would enable communication as well as integration for these schools. Previous attempts at bringing these schools together have failed due to many reasons, however, exploring the philosophical links and rediscovering their Enlightenment roots may provide a fresh look.

### 5.3. Conclusion

Approaches by three distinct schools to the GWOt illustrate that they are essentially complementary lenses. As it has been shown all schools are especially concerned with practices. They differ in the sense that the AS focuses more on emancipatory practices, the CS explores the practices that ‘create’ security through speech acts, and finally the PS scrutinises the ‘security practices’ implemented by professionals in the field,

The AS is a normative critical understanding which believes in change. The change, however, can only be achieved through a constant and immanent critique of prevailing practices in the global arena. “Speaking truth to power” is very important and the process for *emancipation* is an endless endeavour. The CS calls for desecuritisation and its normativity is hidden in this call, however, the framework CS puts forward readies the groundwork for deeper penetration in terms of how security is given meaning. The PS, in this sense, problematises these actors which try to “speak truth to power”. The professionals within the field which legitimise the (in)securitisation efforts may not be speaking truth to power but they do speak to power and this ensures the reproduction of problematic discourses and the continuation of the field with the (in)security habitus. When the PS call for a deconstruction of the field and put forward a positive security agenda, it actually converges with the AS’s desire for emancipatory politics. It is true that the PS perceives this emancipatory logic as problematic because of the historical baggage and possible sedimentation of another field of professionals seeking to exist by similar governmentality of a different name.

This shows that the divergence of traditions does not implicate a total ontological and epistemological incompatibility. It is rather the conjunctures and specific experiences that shaped what is observed as divergence. Starting with Enlightenment from a similar point, these understandings reached another similar point through their own experiences and paths. Because in the end, Enlightenment values and ideals are at the core. When the PS critiques surveillance and problematise liberty-security equilibrium, or when the CS calls for desecuritisation and return to

normal politics so that deliberative processes can function; or when the AS argues that fundamental rights and freedoms for all, and being free from fear and constraints is *emancipation* and *emancipation* is security; these are 20th and 21st century reflections of Kant, Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu and many more of the brilliant enlightened minds. It should not be forgotten that even Jacques Derrida was committed to the “great classical discourse of *emancipation*” and therefore to the enlightenment ideals.